



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,646	03/06/2002	Senthil Prabhakaran	12849-003001	8485
20792	7590	03/22/2006	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			WU, QING YUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/092,646	Applicant(s) PRABAKARAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Qing-Yuan Wu	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/9/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7, 9-12 and 14-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7, 9-12 and 14-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ International Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 3-7, 9-12 and 14-22 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 3-7, 9-12 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 3-7, 9-12 and 14-21 are directed to method steps which can be practiced mentally in conjunction with pen and paper, therefore they are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, as claimed, it is uncertain what performs each of the claimed method steps. The claimed steps do not define a machine or computer implemented process [see MPEP 2106]. (The examiner suggests applicant to change “method” to “computer implemented method” in the preamble to overcome the outstanding 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2194

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification lacks the corresponding structure of means for detecting a problem as recited in claim 22. More specifically, the limitation was not disclosed in the specification in a way that one skilled in the art will understand what structure (or material or acts) will perform the recited function. See MPEP 2181.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 9-10, 15, 19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The following claim language is indefinite:

i. As per claims 15, 19 and 21, it is uncertain what applicant mean by “and/or” (i.e. does applicant means “and or or”? Applicant is reminded that the claim language should be “particularly point out and distinctly claim” their claim invention. For examining purpose, examiner will treat the above limitation as an “or”).

- ii. As per claim 22, it is uncertain what “means” is/are performing the function of “detecting a problem” (i.e. is there a program or module that is specifically used for detecting such a problem?).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boswell, (“Inside Windows 2000 Server”, published 12/22/1999), in view of Van Huben et al (hereafter Van Huben) (U.S. Patent 5,878,408).

10. Boswell was cited in the last office action.

11. As to claim 14, Boswell teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for selective restoring of policy objects associated with a directory service of a computer system, comprising:

backing up a plurality of the policy objects associated with the directory service of the computer system [Chap. 11, Backing Up the Directory, pg. 1; Performing Directory Maintenance, pg. 10 section Performing an Authoritative Directory Restoration; Chap. 16,

Managing User Environments with Group Policies, pg. 1, line 5; Chap. 6, Configuring Security Policies, pg. 4 section Group Policy Editor Overview; Fig. 6.3; Chap. 6, Configuring Security Policies, Fig. 6.3] (i.e....backing up the registry and the Active Directory...restore Directory operation by soft recovery...restore from backup tape...).

12. Boswell does not specifically teach detecting a problem with a selected one of the plurality of policy objects; and restoring the selected one of the plurality of policy objects without restoring others of the plurality of policy objects. However, Boswell disclosed corruption of the directory database that requires restoring and restoring the all system files [Chap. 11, Performing Directory Maintenance, pg. 1, lines 2-3; Repairing the Active Directory Database, pg. 9, lines 1-4] and the drawback of the inability to backup or restore just the Registry or just the Directory or just the boot files [Chap. 11, Backing Up the Directory, pg. 1]. Van Huben teaches restoring individual data objects from backed-up or archived repositories in the event the data object is deleted from the active library [Van Huben, col. 26, lines 23-43].

13. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching of Boswell with the teaching of Van Huben because the teaching of Van Huben compensate the drawback of Boswell by providing the ability to recover individual objects.

14. As to claims 3-5, Boswell as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the directory service further includes user, computers and printers objects

[Chap. 8, Strategies for Upper-Level Designs, pg. 3 section Functional Overview of Windows 2000 Security Groups, line 8; Chap. 15, Moving Forward, line 3] (i.e.... Active Directory objects that represent security principals, such as users, computers...printer objects...).

15. As to claim 6, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 3-5 above (Examiner's interpretation of "a directory service component with a descriptive parameter," as any directory service objects with attributes/properties/settings since the applicant did not preclude nor define this limitation).

16. As to claim 7, Boswell as modified does not specifically teach wherein backing up includes storing object settings, links to directory service objects, and security information regarding directory service objects. However, Boswell disclosed backing up the system state files which includes the Active Directory database, NTDS.DIT, and its associated log and checkpoint files, contents of the \SYSVOL directory, etc. [Chap. 11, Backing Up the Directory, pg. 1]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that attributes, information, or settings related to a directory service object have to be backed-up in order for the object to be restore to its previous configuration.

17. As to claim 11, Boswell as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein policy data associated with a policy object is stored in a database [Chap. 6,

Art Unit: 2194

Configuring Security Policies, pg. 11] (i.e. Security policies for a local machine are stored in the Security Editor database...).

18. As to claim 12, Boswell as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the database where policy data is stored is the registry [Chap. 6, Configuring Security Policies, pg. 12, lines 6-7].

19. As to claims 15-16, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claim 14 above.

20. As to claim 17, Boswell as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein restoring the selected one of the plurality of policy objects includes replicating the selected one of the plurality of policy objects across domain boundaries of the computer system [Chap. 11, Replication Overview, pg. 5 Intrasite Replication Summary].

21. As to claim 19, Boswell as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein a security privilege of the computer system is required to restore and/or effect a particular setting of the policy objects and wherein the method further comprises: delegating the security privilege to selected users for selected objects in the directory service [Chap. 10, Overview of Directory Security, pg. 13 section Access Rights Delegation] (i.e.... Windows 2000 uses delegation to assign the right mix of access permissions...select the object types over which the security principal will exercise control...).

22. As to claim 9, Boswell as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein various levels of security privileges can be delegated [Chap. 10, Overview of Directory Security, pg. 14-17 section Access Rights Delegation, Figs. 10.9-10.11].

23. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 9 above. In addition, Boswell as modified does not specifically teach wherein the levels of security privileges that can be delegated include the ability to configure only one or a plurality of administrative templates contained in the policy. However, Boswell disclosed modifying administrative templates [Chap. 16, Managing User Environments with Group policies, pg. 15, lines 4-9] and delegating extended rights [Chap. 10, Overview of Directory Security, pg. 16 section Delegating Extended Rights, lines 3-8]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that granular delegation of security privileges can further relief the burden of the administrator (i.e. assigning some administrative rights to users without granting administrative privileges, as been considered by Boswell) without risking the security of an entire active directory.

24. As to claims 20-21, Boswell as modified does not specifically teach restoring the selected one of the plurality of objects to a domain/a parent and/or child of a domain of the computer system from which it was backed up. However, Boswell disclosed replicating the selected one of the plurality of policy objects across domain boundaries of the computer system [Chap. 11, Replication Overview, pg. 5 Intrasite Replication Summary]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have restore objects to a

Art Unit: 2194

domain/a parent and/or child of a domain of the computer system from which it was backed up because the purpose of restoring is to restore to a location where the objects are needed.

25. As to claim 22, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 14 above.

26. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boswell and Van Huben as applied to claims 14 and 22 above, in view of Sanghvi et al (hereafter Sanghvi) (U.S. PGPub 20020095524A1).

27. Sanghvi was cited in the last office action.

28. As to claim 18, Boswell does not specifically teach analyzing the effect a particular setting of one of the policy objects will have on a particular target represented as a directory service object before the particular setting is implemented in the directory service. However, Sanghvi teaches testing policies before applying the policies to the target nodes [Sanghvi, paragraph 46, lines 3-4; 406, Fig. 5].

29. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching of Boswell, Van Huben and Sanghvi because the teaching of Sanghvi would provide an error prevention/detection mechanism that tests the effect of policies before they are actually implemented on the target.

Art Unit: 2194

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Qing-Yuan Wu

Examiner

Art Unit 2194


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER